



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR PERFORMANCE OF EXPERT PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES ON AN AS-NEEDED BASIS FOR THE PORT AUTHORITY AIRTRAIN NEWARK REPLACEMENT PROGRAM DURING 2023 THROUGH 2030**  
**RFP NO.6000001388 - REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**  
**DATE: 02/28/2023**

RFI #	Section Reference	Question/Request for Clarification	Port Authority Response
1	N/A	Due to the complexity of the scope of this RFP, and the date of the response to questions integral to proposal development, we request an extension of two weeks	The Port Authority has extended the deadline for proposals to March 9, 2023. Please refer to Addendum #1 with the latest.
2	N/A	Does award of this project preclude the firm from future PANYNJ projects under this program?	At this time, firms are not expressly precluded from future EWR solicitations. However, these matters will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as they arise. The Port Authority reserves the right to do what is in its best interests, including to review and/or reduce the scope of the design services contract as appropriate, require a mitigation plan and/or determine that an immitigable conflict of interest requiring preclusion is present.
3	N/A	If a single entity proposer cannot demonstrate that it meets all of the referenced qualifications, then the single entity proposer may, with others, form a joint venture and request that the joint venture be deemed to be the Proposer (i.e. members of the joint venture may meet the qualification requirement collectively).	Confirmed. Teams may form a joint venture to strengthen their team and meet the requirements of the RFP.

RFI #	Section Reference	Question/Request for Clarification	Port Authority Response
4	N/A	<p>If awarded this work, will this disqualify the awardee from participating in the future Design-Build Contracts for Design and Construction of Guideways and Stations for the new Airtrain.</p>	<p>At this time, firms are not expressly precluded from future EWR solicitations. However, these matters will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as they arise. The Port Authority reserves the right to do what is in its best interests, including to review and/or reduce the scope of the design services contract as appropriate, require a mitigation plan and/or determine that an immitigable conflict of interest requiring preclusion is present.</p>
5	Insurance Provisions	<p>Believe the following insurance requirements are not in line with the market and asked that they be reviewed for lower amounts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The \$25 million airside coverage for general liability</li> <li>2. The \$25 million per claim on the professional liability</li> <li>3. And the cyber \$10 million minimum coverage</li> </ol>	<p>The insurance provisions have been revised. Please refer to Addendum #1 with the latest provisions.</p>
6	N/A	<p>Will the consultant selected for this contract be precluded from future Design Build for the AirTrain Newark replacement program?</p>	<p>At this time, firms are not expressly precluded from future EWR solicitations. However, these matters will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as they arise. The Port Authority reserves the right to do what is in its best interests, including to review and/or reduce the scope of the design services contract as appropriate, require a mitigation plan and/or determine that an immitigable conflict of interest requiring preclusion is present."</p>
7	N/A	<p>Can you please clarify if Minimum Requirement B's intent is that only Proposers who provide both professional architectural and engineering services could be deemed to meet the requirement – i.e. is the expectation that the Proposer/ Prime contractor would have provided BOTH Architecture AND Engineering " services for airport, rail or transportation facility projects" for a minimum of (10) years - or can an Architect who led projects as prime consultant with engineering subconsultants be deemed to meet this minimum requirement.</p>	<p>The following would be acceptable, an engineer or architectural firm that can provide both services, a joint venture between multiple firms, and a prime consultant with engineering or architectural subconsultants.</p>

<b>RFI #</b>	<b>Section Reference</b>	<b>Question/Request for Clarification</b>	<b>Port Authority Response</b>
<b>8</b>	N/A	Project Manager shall have a minimum of ten (10) years' experience and multi-discipline technical expertise on at least (3) similar aviation programs". Would PANYNJ consider dropping the AVIATION aspect of this requirement, leaving it as "(3) similar programs", as the scope for this project is landside and not aviation focused?	Similar projects would include large infrastructure or transportation facilities.
<b>9</b>	N/A	Will the MBE/WBE/LBE/SDVOB subconsultants who participate in this contract be ineligible to participate as subconsultant in any of the design-bid-build or design-build contracts pertaining to the EWR Airtrain Replacement program.	At this time, firms are not expressly precluded from future EWR solicitations. However, these matters will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as they arise. The Port Authority reserves the right to do what is in its best interests, including to review and/or reduce the scope of the design services contract as appropriate, require a mitigation plan and/or determine that an immitigable conflict of interest requiring preclusion is present.
<b>10</b>	RFP letter, page 4 (III. Submission Requirements, E. Firm Qualifications and Experience)	Firm Qualifications and Experience) lists a Lead Architect. Is it acceptable to have a Lead Engineer vs. Lead Architect?	Yes, it is acceptable. See RFI #7 response for further details.
<b>11</b>	RFP Attachment A (p. 42, IX. C. Document Management Standards):	Please confirm that a separate document control platform (software) is to be provided, which will be separate from the Port Authority's system, or shall the internal system for internal document control management be implemented over the Port Authority's document control system/software.	The Consultant will need to track and maintain quality control and document control on their end for all deliverables, correspondences, etc. They will have access to PANYNJ SharePoint, eBuilder and associated platforms.

RFI #	Section Reference	Question/Request for Clarification	Port Authority Response
12	RFP Attachment A (p. 39, VIII. Schedule and Submissions):	Please confirm the timing between the end of Stage II and the Start of Stage III? Will Stage III start immediately upon completion of Stage II, where the overall Stage II and III duration is 12-months?	For the MCF project, the Stage III will follow immediately after Stage II. Other projects may or may not include some lag between stages
13	RFP letter, page 4 (I. Proposer Requirements, Criteria B)	We request that “airports” found on the RFP letter, page 4 (I. Proposer Requirements, Criteria B), include “airports and/or rail transit/ APM facilities .	Similar projects would include large infrastructure or transportation facilities.
14	N/A	In order to give bidders proper time to assemble teams and properly prepare the required proposal inputs as detailed in the RFP, we respectfully request an extension of the bid due date by 3 weeks to March 16, 2023.	The Port Authority has extended the deadline for proposals to March 9, 2023. Please refer to Addendum #1 with the latest.
15	N/A	In order to properly assess staffing requirements for TASK F – STAGE II DESIGN Item 12(1) found on Page 22 of Attachment A, please provide additional information on the anticipated number of design standards and specifications.	Security design standards and specifications will be based on final design of the required level of security deemed necessary by the Port Authority.
16	N/A	Please confirm that there are no Security requirements for Stage III (Final Design).	Stage III will require security design as identified in the Stage II threat analysis and standards report.
17	N/A	Page 4 of Attachment A Scope of Work has open requirements for the limits of work for the demolition of the existing Airtrain Guideway: “d. Selective demolition and reconstruction at tie-in locations” and “i. Other facilities subject to determination of final alignment.” Please define limits of work for these items.	Item D - Tie-in Locations refers to demolition required for the Pedestrian Connector scope where tying into existing Terminals B and C, if necessary. Item I - Demolition of other existing facilities, or portions thereof that are associated with the existing AirTrain at Newark Liberty International Airport, as required.

RFI #	Section Reference	Question/Request for Clarification	Port Authority Response
18	N/A	Attachment A, Section II II. INTRODUCTION states that Consultant services "...shall consist of the preparation of a Basis of Design, Stage II Design, Stage III Final Design and Contract Documents...". However, Attachment A Section VIII. SCHEDULE AND SUBMISSIONS does not show a schedule for the Basis of Design; please provide the anticipated schedule for the Basis of Design document.	Stage II Basis of Design Submissions listed in the SCHEDULE AND MILESTONES includes both the associated drawings and basis of design report.
19	N/A	Please confirm that Proposers are to provide cost data as part of their Attachment D - Staffing and Cost Analysis Sheet submittal with the proposal, based on Attachment A – Scope of Services, for all firms on the Proposers team?	This is confirmed. Attachment D should align with all of the scope of services for all firms performing the work required of Attachment A - Scope of Services.
20	N/A	Attachment A Section II.h, "Pedestrian Connectors" (page 3) of states "Provide for an analysis of the Newark Liberty International Airport Visioning Study to develop alternative Pedestrian Connector concepts in lieu of the three connectors described in this document."; are multiple options for the Pedestrian Connectors being considered? If so, please indicate how many alternative concepts Proposers would be providing.	One additional concept for the Terminal C to Station 3 connectors will be required, subject to change.
21	N/A	Please confirm that the new deadline for submitting Questions is now March 2, 2023.	This is confirmed. Questions may be submitted until noon on March 2, 2023.
22	N/A	Has PANYNJ developed a Stage I report?	The Port Authority has prepared a basis of design for the MCF and currently there are concept designs for pedestrian connectors, both will be shared with the selected proposer. There is no Stage I report for the demolition scopes of work.
23	N/A	Please clarify the scope of work for the Pedestrian Connectors as the scope (Attachment A, page 2 and 3) describes three connectors from: Station 3 to Terminal C, Terminal B to Terminal C, and Station 3 to P4 Parking Garage, however the graphic shown in the Pre-proposal meeting (Pre-proposal Meeting Presentation, page 13) also indicates a direct connector from Station 3 to Terminal B.	The connectors listed as Station 3 to Terminal B is not in the scope of this project.

<b>RFI #</b>	<b>Section Reference</b>	<b>Question/Request for Clarification</b>	<b>Port Authority Response</b>
<b>24</b>	N/A	Is there a yard in the scope of work for this contract?	The MCF yard is included in the scope of work.
<b>25</b>	N/A	RFP Section II.A (Proposal Format Requirements) requires the use of a 12 point font. Please confirm that the 12-point font requirement does not apply to graphics and figures, such as the organizational chart, and that a smaller-size, legible font can be used for figures and graphics.	Confirmed. The 12-point font requirement is only for narratives of the final proposal. The font requirement does not apply to graphics and figures.
<b>26</b>	2. RFP Section III.F (Technical Approach)	"As part of your technical approach, prepare a staffing plan for performance of each task in Attachment A, using the Excel spreadsheet, Attachment D (Staffing and Cost Analysis Sheet). Include names and titles of individuals proposed to perform each of the tasks identified." Please confirm that Attachment D (Staffing and Cost Analysis Sheet) will not be counted toward the 30-page limit.	No, Attachment D will not be included in the 30 page limit.
<b>27</b>	N/A	Please describe the scope of the Lead System Designer with respect to civil and infrastructure work in relationship with the Stages II and III MCF design. I.e. – define limits of scope of Systems Lead Systems Designer and A/E As-Needed Airtrain Newark Replacement Program civil and infrastructure designer.	As stated in Attachment A, page 2, the design of the MCF will need to be coordinated with other Authority retained contractors providing the System Technology and other civil works (e.g. stations and guideway) to provide a fully functional facility.
<b>28</b>	N/A	Without input of designers of the MCF, the Basis of Design for this scope, relative to the MCF, will be incomplete. Can the proposer assume that the Early Interface Requirements will be issued within the first two months after Stage II NTP in order to be included in the Basis of Design report?	The early interface requirements will be issued to the selected proposer early third quarter 2023.
<b>29</b>	N/A	Please confirm whether Proposers can assume that the detailed design and location of connectors' interface to Station 3 (Station 3 under separate Contract) will be performed in conjunction with the Designer(s) of that program element, and that accordingly, work associated with that detailed interface can be excluded from fee for this proposal – or – should Proposers assume that design work associated with the connectors/Station 3 interface will proceed concurrently with the work of this contract?	The selected proposers connector design will be concurrent with the design of the station (under separate Contract).